United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of
Information

Selected Speeches and News Releases

August 10 - August 17, 1989

IN THIS ISSUE:

News Releases—

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Information

USDA ANNOUNCES PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE FOR UPLAND COTTON

WASHINGTON, Aug. 10—Under Secretary of Agriculture Richard T. Crowder today announced the prevailing world market price, adjusted to U.S. quality and location (adjusted world price), for Strict Low Middling (SLM) 1-1/16 inch (micronaire 3.5-4.9) upland cotton (base quality) and the coarse count adjustment in effect from 12:01 a.m. Friday, Aug. 11, through midnight Thursday, Aug. 17.

Since the adjusted world price (AWP) is above the 1987, 1988 and 1989 crop base quality loan rates of 52.25, 51.80 and 50.00 cents per pound, respectively, the loan repayment rates for the 1987, 1988 and 1989 crops of upland cotton during this period are equal to the respective loan rates for the specific quality and location.

The AWP will continue to be used to determine the value of upland cotton that is obtained in exchange for commodity certificates. Because the AWP in effect is above the established loan rate, loan deficiency payments are not available for 1989-crop upland cotton sold during this period.

Based on data for the week ending Aug. 10, the AWP for upland cotton and the coarse count adjustment are determined as follows:

Table follows

Adjusted World Price

Northern Europe Price		82.80
Adjustments:		
Average U.S. spot market location	11.96	
SLM 1-1/16 inch cotton	2.20	
Average U.S. location	0.39	
Sum of Adjustments		-14.55
ADJUSTED WORLD PRICE		68.25 cents/lb.

Coarse Count Adjustment

Northern Europe Price	82.80
Northern Europe Coarse Count Price	-78.60
	4.20
Adjustment to SLM 1-inch cotton	-4.75
	-0.55
COARSE COUNT ADJUSTMENT	0 cents/lb.

The next AWP and coarse count adjustment announcement will be made on Aug. 17.

Charles Cunningham (202) 447-7954

#

TRAP, LURE CUT THE PICKLEWORM WAR IN HALF

WASHINGTON, Aug. 11—A box trap and a sex lure synthesized by U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists may help farmers cut their pesticide use against pickleworms almost in half.

Pickleworms are major insect pests that follow spring weather north each year to lay eggs in cucumber fields. That spells trouble, for example, in the 50,000 acres of cukes in North and South Carolina, two major cucumber growing states.

As summer progresses, the insect becomes a problem in states farther north as adult moths lay their eggs, and pickleworm larvae hatch and eat their way into young cucumbers.

Pickle packers generally refuse to accept a truckload of cucumbers if they notice even one cuke with a pickleworm hole.

Growers often start spraying their fields with pesticides as soon as the night-time temperature reaches 60 degrees F—the temperature the moths

follow north. Spraying is routinely done almost every week during the moths' 6- to 7-week season.

But Kent D. Elsey, an entomologist with USDA's Agricultural Research Service at the U.S. Vegetable Laboratory in Charleston, S.C., is planning an end to this blitzkrieg approach to crop protection. Elsey is devising a warning system so that farmers need apply pesticides only when there are actually pickleworms in the fields.

A pheromone—a naturally-produced scent that attracts the moths' mates—is placed inside 3-foot-square box traps in cucumber fields. Male moths follow the scent into the boxes and become trapped inside.

"Once the adult pickleworm moths start appearing in the traps, then it is time to begin spraying," Elsey said.

The copy of the pheromone was synthesized by entomologist Jerome A. Klun at the ARS Chemical Ecology Laboratory in Beltsville, Md.

"It takes only a small amount of the pheromone to bait each trap. Just a tiny amount on a bit of rubber about the size of a pencil eraser will last about a week," Elsey said. In recent trials, using the traps to monitor for the presence of moths, he was able to control the pickleworm with about half the number of sprayings.

"Some years pickleworms don't appear at all, and in those years growers could avoid any spraying if a monitoring system like this were in place," Elsey said.

He envisions a line of traps that Extension agents or others could check and then send out appropriate warnings or all-clear alerts—kind of an early warning line against pickleworms.

Kim Kaplan (301) 344-3932

#

USDA ISSUES REPORTS ON FINANCING RURAL ROADS AND BRIDGES

WASHINGTON, Aug. 11—You can't plan transportation systems very well if you don't have the facts and figures.

To help planners of rural transportation systems get those facts and figures, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Office of Transportation has issued two publications that provide valuable information on how the Nation's rural roads and bridges are financed.

According to Martin F. "Buzz" Fitzpatrick, Jr., OT administrator, the

detailed findings in the two research reports are based on a two-year study. "One publication focuses on Federal and State financing of rural roads and bridges," he said, "and the other zeroes in on local governments."

"This is new and unique information never assembled in one place. It should be extremely helpful to transportation officials at all levels who need basic information to plan for the future of the rural road system."

Although over 80 percent of the Nation's total highway mileage is in rural areas, there is little collective understanding about the condition of rural roads and bridges and the financing of improvements by State and local governments. Only about 20 percent of the rural mileage is eligible for Federal funding, while 40 percent of the rural bridges are on the Federal-aid system.

Fitzpatrick said the reports show that, given current resources, it is questionable whether many local governments can spend the money needed for maintenance, let alone the amount needed to upgrade roads and bridges for higher traffic volumes and weights.

"Local rural officials report they will postpone new construction, reduce equipment expenses and further defer maintenance in response to revenue shortfalls," he said. "A continuation of this trend will lead to higher future expenditures and further disinvestment in the rural transportation system."

The nationwide study on financing rural roads and bridges was carried out by Western Illinois University in cooperation with the National Association of Towns and Townships, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of County Engineers and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. OT helped develop the survey questionnaire, provided statistics on rural bridges and printed the two reports.

This study builds on two earlier studies of rural road and bridge financing in four midwestern States, Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin, completed by OT and Western Illinois University in 1983 and 1987.

Copies of the two new publications, "Rural Roads and Bridges: Federal and State Financing," and "Rural Roads and Bridges: A Dilemma for Local Officials," are available by writing OT-USDA, P.O. Box 96575, Washington, D.C., 20090-6575. For more information telephone (202) 653-6305.

Larry Mark (202) 447-2186

#

MEATS AND ALTERNATES—USDA HELPS FIND THE BEST BUYS

WASHINGTON, Aug. 14—Turkey, ground beef, pork shoulder, ground chuck and whole chicken were found to be the best meat buys in a recent study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The economy of a cut depends on the amount of cooked lean meat or the number of servings it provides, as well as its price per pound, according to Dr. James T. Heimbach, acting administrator of the Human Nutrition Information Service. "Relatively high-priced meat cuts with little or no waste may be more economical than low-priced cuts with a great deal of bone, gristle or fat," he said.

Costs in this study, which included meat alternates as well as selected types and cuts of meat, poultry and fish, were estimated using nationwide prices collected in June 1989 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor.

The study also compared the costs of 20 grams of protein—about one-third of the recommended daily allowance for a man—from selected meats and alternates. Some meat alternates—such as peanut butter and eggs—are as good or better buys than less expensive cuts of meat. However, some processed meat products, such as frankfurters and bologna, were found to cost more as sources of protein than some beef roasts and steaks.

Heimbach said that while a 3-ounce serving of cooked lean meat, poultry, or fish provides 20 grams of protein or more, the amount of some alternates and meat products required to provide 20 grams of protein is well over the amount people normally eat in a day. For example, it takes 5 tablespoons of peanut butter, four frankfurters, or 10 slices of bacon to provide 20 grams of protein.

Heimbach said consumers can use the following tables to obtain comparable costs for meats and alternates in their supermarkets by multiplying the part of the market unit figure by the local price per unit.

Estimated Cost of Meats and Alternates

Cost of 3 ounces of cooked lean from specified meat and poultry using nationwide prices collected in June 1989:

	Retail price per pound*	Part of pound for 3 ounces of cooked lean	Cost of 3 ounces of cooked lean
Turkey, ready-to-cook	$1.01	0.41	$0.41
Ground beef, regular	1.44	.29	.42
Pork shoulder, smoked, bone in	1.08	.46	.50
Ground chuck	1.80	.28	.50
Chicken, whole, ready-to-cook	.98	.55	.54
Ham, canned	2.68	.25	.67
Chuck roast of beef, bone in	1.86	.44	.82
Round roast of beef, bone out	2.73	.30	.82
Chicken breasts, bone in	2.26	.40	.90
Round beefsteak, bone out	3.06	.32	.98
Pork chops, center cut, bone in	2.82	.42	1.18
Sirloin beefsteak, bone in	3.67	.38	1.39
Rib roast of beef, bone in	4.06	.43	1.75
T-bone beefsteak, bone in	5.16	.41	2.12

Cost of 20 grams of protein from specified meats and meat alternates at June 1989 prices:

	Market unit	Price per market unit*	Part of market unit to give 20 grams of protein**	Cost of 20 grams of protein
Eggs, large	doz	$0.94	0.28	$0.26
Peanut butter	18 oz	2.03	.16	.32
Bread, white, enriched***	lb	.66	.50	.33
Turkey, ready-to-cook	lb	1.01	.33	.33
Pork shoulder, smoked, bone in	lb	1.08	.32	.35
Tuna, canned	6.5 oz	.85	.41	.35
Milk, whole, fluid****	1/2 gal	1.25	.31	.39
Ground beef, regular	lb	1.44	.27	.39
Chicken, whole, ready-to-cook	lb	.98	.42	.41
Ground chuck	lb	1.80	.25	.45
Chuck roast of beef, bone in	lb	1.86	.29	.54
Cheddar cheese, natural	lb	3.20	.18	.58
American process cheese	lb	2.93	.20	.59
Chicken breasts, bone in	lb	2.26	.27	.61
Round beefsteak, bone out	lb	3.06	.22	.67
Ham, canned	lb	2.68	.26	.70
Frankfurters, all meat	lb	2.02	.39	.79
Bologna	lb	2.24	.38	.85
Bacon, sliced	lb	1.69	.52	.88
Pork chops, center cut, bone in	lb	2.82	.32	.90
Pork sausage, bulk	lb	1.93	.47	.91
Sirloin beefsteak, bone in	lb	3.67	.26	.95
Rib roast of beef, bone in	lb	4.06	.32	1.30
T-bone beefsteak, bone in	lb	5.16	.30	1.55

* U.S. average retail price of food item estimated using information provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

** About one-third of the daily amount recommended for a 20-year-old man. Assumes that all meat is eaten.

*** Bread and other grain products, such as pasta and rice, frequently are used with a small amount of meat, poultry, fish, or cheese as main dishes in economy

meals. In this way, the high-quality protein in meat and cheese enhances the lower quality of protein in cereal products.
**** Although milk is not used to replace meat in meals, it is an economical source of good-quality protein.

Jerry Smith (301) 436-8617

#

USDA SLOWS NORTHWARD MOVEMENT OF AFRICANIZED HONEY BEE

WASHINGTON, Aug. 14—U.S. Department of Agriculture plant protection officials said today that the Africanized honey bee has been found 400 miles south of the Texas-Mexico border near Tecolutla, Veracruz, Mexico. The migrating bee originally was expected to reach the southern United States in 1987 or 1988, but estimates now indicate that Texans in the Rio Grande River Valley will not see the bee for another 18 months or later.

"Our two-year cooperative effort with Mexico to slow the movement of the Africanized bee has delayed the bee's arrival in the United States," said James W. Glosser, administrator of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. "This delay should give researchers and beekeepers enough time to study the bee and learn how to manage it."

The Africanized honey bee is the hybrid offspring of European honey bees and pure African queens brought to Brazil in 1956 for research. Under circumstances that remain unexplained, the African queens escaped into the Brazilian countryside and began interbreeding with native honey bees. Africanized bees have since spread northward and were found in southern Mexico in late 1986.

APHIS and its Mexican government counterpart began operating the Cooperative Program for the Control of Africanized Honey Bees in Sept. 1987. Since then, they have worked in two areas along Mexico's Pacific and Gulf coasts to develop ways to manage the Africanized bee and encourage hybridization resulting in a bee more like the docile variety common in United States.

The cooperative program operates two trap lines along Mexico's Gulf coast in the States of Tamaulipas and Veracruz. These trap lines will be used to detect and track the movement of the Africanized bee as it nears the U.S. border.

According to Glosser, scientists in USDA's Agricultural Research Service have studied Africanized bee behavior and genetics for more than 15 years. "Our colleagues in ARS have worked closely with us on this project from the beginning, and their research supports the goals of the cooperative program," Glosser said.

ARS also provides technical guidance and operates a 24-hour on call laboratory for identification of suspected Africanized bees from interceptions in the United States and Mexico. Africanized bees have been found several times in U.S. ports aboard ships from South and Central America, but all of these bees were killed.

One of the cooperative program's more visible activities involves surveying for populations of Africanized bees, trapping and destroying them to reduce these populations. Traps designed to capture bee swarms are laced with a pheromone lure, or chemical message, that says "this is a good nesting site." The traps are placed in trees around the countryside and checked every two weeks. Any bees found in a trap are killed and sent to a program laboratory for identification.

"Program personnel in Mexico have hung almost 60,000 traps in the last 18 months and have caught more than 11,000 swarms of Africanized bees. That's millions of Africanized bees that will never reach the United States," Glosser said.

The Program also works to reduce the transfer of Africanized traits to managed honey bee colonies through requeening. Requeening encourages beekeepers to select queens from desirable genetic stock and mark them with a bright paint so it's easy to tell if they are in the hive. If an unmarked queen is found in a hive, she could be Africanized, so she is replaced with another marked queen known to be of good genetic stock.

Glosser said one of the most important benefits gained from cooperating with Mexico is a better understanding of how to manage Africanized bees. This technology already is being transferred to the Mexican public, and can be used to educate the U.S. public also, he said.

Janna Evans (301) 436-7279

#

USDA CONFIRMS CONTINUATION OF BOLL WEEVIL ERADICATION PROGRAM IN SOUTHEAST

WASHINGTON, Aug. 14—Despite larger than expected populations of boll weevil, the number one insect pest of U.S. cotton, the U.S. Department of Agriculture confirmed today that the southeast eradication program is on course and will continue in Alabama, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina.

Boll weevil populations in the eradication program areas are averaging less than one weevil per acre, according to James W. Glosser, administrator for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Although traps in similar nearby fields outside the program are collecting hundreds of pests per acre, the pest populations in the program areas are higher than expected for the second full year of an eradication program and are requiring extra treatments.

"Program operations are continuing to meet the challenge of combating the weevil, and are trapping and treating fields according to established guidelines," Glosser said. "The program has made significant progress despite three consecutive winters of mild temperatures that left more weevils than entomologists expected."

In the cooperative federal-state-industry program, APHIS supplies equipment, technical and administrative support and funds 30 percent of program costs. Growers pay 70 percent of program costs in two annual assessments, due in April and July. Glosser reminds producers that continued treatment of fields and viability of the program depends upon each grower paying their assessed share of program costs—voted into law by producer referendums.

Last year's unusual winter has left boll weevil populations at or near a 30-year high across much of the cotton belt, according to James Smith, Research Leader at USDA's boll weevil research unit in Mississippi State.

"Winters usually kill 95 percent of the boll weevil population," Smith said. "Last winter left weevil populations with no noticeable decline. Spring weevil populations in the Mississippi delta—an area that is not currently in the eradication program but is traditionally far less weevilinfested than Georgia or Alabama—are seven times higher than last year, and up to 35 times higher than in 1986."

"This program is well-designed, well-staffed and has been proven successful in Arizona, California, the Carolinas and Virginia. Ultimately,

it will be successful in Alabama, Florida and Georgia as well," Glosser said.

Boll weevil is the number one U.S. agricultural insect pest, inflicting annual damage of $300 million and requiring more insecticide to control than any other. Estimates place damage due to boll weevil at $12 billion since its entry from Mexico in 1892.

Under cooperative federal-state-industry programs, boll weevil has been successfully eliminated from Virginia, North Carolina, California's Imperial Valley and western Arizona and most of South Carolina. In addition to the southeast, eradication activities are currently underway in central and eastern Arizona and northern Mexico.

Anita K. Brown (301) 436-7279

#

FGIS TO OFFER SOYBEAN OIL, PROTEIN TESTING AS OFFICIAL CRITERIA

WASHINGTON, Aug. 15—The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Federal Grain Inspection Service will offer oil and protein testing of commercial shipments of soybeans starting Sept. 4.

Oil and protein content will not be official grade criteria for soybeans, but upon request, FGIS will analyze cleaned soybean samples on near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) equipment and report oil and protein content to the nearest tenth of one percent on official inspection certificates.

The determinations of oil and protein content will be made on a 13-percent moisture basis. Results will not be reported on an "as is" moisture basis since oil and protein content varies with moisture content.

FGIS will not at this time determine inspection tolerances for soybean oil and protein under the agency's shiplot inspection plan. To establish such tolerances, field test results are needed over a period of time to develop a data base allowing the formulation of standard deviations and breakpoints.

In a related action, FGIS announced it is withdrawing its proposal to require the reporting of soybean oil and protein content on official inspection certificates for grading. FGIS Administrator W. Kirk Miller said the decision to withdraw the proposal was based on information and comments from the trade. The withdrawal of the proposal does not

preclude FGIS from proposing the action at a later date, Miller said.

These final actions will be published Aug. 16 in the Federal Register.

Allen A. Atwood (202) 475-3367

#

USDA TARGETS EXPORT ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL 1990

WASHINGTON, Aug. 15—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced 46 organizations eligible to receive $200 million in Targeted Export Assistance (TEA) allocations for fiscal 1990.

The Food Security Act of 1985 requires that USDA use Commodity Credit Corporation funds or commodities to counter or offset the adverse effects of unfair foreign trade practices on U.S. agricultural exports.

Eligibility for the TEA program resources is determined on the basis of proposals received during the 45-day period for applications and criteria announced in the Federal Register May 3.

The TEA program is administered by USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service through cooperative agreements between the Commodity Credit Corp. and the agricultural industry representatives listed here.

These agreements will be finalized after Congress completes its work on fiscal 1990 appropriations, and the appropriations bill has been signed into law.

For additional information and referral to the appropriate program contact, call (202) 447-5521.

(A list of the 46 participants follows.)

Targeted Export Assistance Participants, Fiscal 1990

Nonprofit Applicant Organizations	Commodities	(Million $)
Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute	Salmon	4.500
American Plywood Association	Solid wood products (excluding paper & pulp) including most softwood products	6.500
American Sheep Industry Association	Wool (raw, scoured & top)	0.148
American Soybean Association	Soybeans & products	11.500
California Cling Peach Advisory Board	Canned and frozen cling peaches & canned fruit cocktail	3.500
California Kiwifruit Commission	Fresh kiwifruit	0.900
California Pistachio Commission	Pistachios, raw & roasted	0.750
California Prune Board	Prunes	7.500
California Raisin Advisory Board	Raisins	12.500
California Strawberry Advisory Board	Strawberries, fresh & frozen	0.500
California Table Grape Commission	Fresh table grapes	2.300
California Tree Fruit Agreement	Plums, peaches, nectarines & Bartlett pears	0.500

California Walnut Commission	Walnuts, shelled & in-shell	8.000
Cherry Marketing Institute, Inc.	Processed tart cherries (dried, water-packed, canned, frozen, individually quick frozen, juice concentrate & juice products)	0.400
Chocolate Manufacturers Association of America	Chocolate & sugar confectionery	0.900
Concord Grape Association	Concord & Niagara grape products	0.700
Cotton Council International	Raw cotton	15.400
Eastern United States Agricultural & Food Export Council, Inc. (EUSAFEC)	Regional high-value food products	2.950
Florida Department of Citrus	Florida fresh & processed citrus	9.900
Hop Growers of America	Hops, hop cones & hop pellets	0.050
Kentucky Distillers' Association	Bourbon whiskey	2.000
Mid-America International Agri-Trade Council (MIATCO)	Regional high-value food products	2.700
National Association of Animal Breeders	Bovine semen	0.402
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA)	National high-value food products	0.750
National Forest Products Association	Solid wood products (excluding paper & pulp) including hardwood products	7.400

National Honey Board	Honey	1.000
National Peanut Council	Peanuts (shelled & in-shell)	4.500
National Potato Promotion Board	Frozen french fried potatoes, frozen potato products, fresh potatoes & seed potatoes	4.800
National Sunflower Association	Sunflowerseed & & confection sunflowerseed	4.000
Northwest Horticultural Council/ Washington State Apple Commission	Fresh apples	3.800
Northwest Horticultural Council/ Northwest Cherry Growers	Fresh sweet cherries	1.000
Northwest Horticultural Council/ Oregon-Washington-California Pear Bureau	Fresh pears	0.900
Rice Council for Market Development	Rice	8.500
Southern United States Trade Association (SUSTA)	Regional high-value food products	2.700
Texas Produce Export Association	Fresh grapefruit	0.150
Tobacco Associates, Inc.	Unmanufactured tobacco	5.000
USA Poultry & Egg Export Council	Poultry (chicken, turkey, ducks, eggs & game birds) & products	6.000
U.S. Feed Grains Council	Feed grains (corn, sorghum & barley)	6.000

U.S. Meat Export Federation	Red meats (beef, pork, lamb & mutton), related variety meats, offals & processed products	9.000
U.S. Mink Export Development Council	Mink pelts	1.500
U.S. Wheat Associates, Inc.	Wheat	5.200
Wine Institute	Grape wine	9.000
Western United States Agricultural Trade Association (WUSATA)	Regional high-value food products	5.250
Export Incentive Program[1]	Processed and natural almonds	9.000
Export Incentive Program[1]	California & Arizona fresh processed citrus	8.800
Export Incentive Program[1]	Processed sweet corn (canned whole kernel & and cream style, canned corn mixtures, frozen corn on the cob, frozen whole kernel, cream style & mixtures)	1.250
	TOTAL	200.000

[1]Program details and application procedures for each EIP branded promotion program will be announced at a later date.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 447-3448

#

IN COWS AT LEAST, ALL BACTERIA-KILLING WHITE BLOOD CELLS ARE NOT THE SAME

WASHINGTON, Aug. 16—U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists are trying to find a tougher white blood cell to help cows resist a disease that costs farmers $2 billion a year.

White blood cells fight disease in animals and humans, attacking invading bacteria that cause infections. Max J. Paape and Albert J. Guidry, animal physiologists with USDA's Agricultural Research Service, discovered that certain white blood cells called neutrophils were not all alike in dairy cows.

Over the last two years, animal physiologists Paape and Guidry observed subtle differences in the way neutrophils react to infectious bacteria. "Some neutrophils are 'lazy' and don't readily attack, while others attack bacteria with zeal," Paape said.

Paape said laboratory tests are being run, "to see if a more aggressive neutrophil can be found for use against costly mastitis infection in dairy cows." He and Dr. Guidry are undertaking the research at the Milk Secretion and Mastitis Laboratory at the ARS Research Center, Beltsville, Md.

"Up until now most scientists thought that neutrophils were virtually the same. It is the first time such aggressive differences have been found in the neutrophils of cattle," said Paape.

If the search for a feisty neutrophil is successful, the scientists want to confirm that it will seek out and destroy the various bacteria that cause mastitis in dairy cows. Mastitis, an infection of the udder, is costly in medication and lost milk for dairy farmers.

Paape said earlier research at the Beltsville laboratory showed that neutrophils could be made to appear in a cow's udder. A roughened coiled plastic loop, inserted into a cow's teats, causes a mild irritation that stimulates the flow of white blood cells including neutrophils to the udder to fight possible invasion of bacteria.

"Cows bred with more aggressive neutrophils would probably cut the incidence of mastitis, not eliminate it," Guidry said. Medicines would still be needed, he added, to cure animals that get sick. If mastitis is not treated, it can kill a cow.

Crucial to the research was a sophisticated cell analyzer, called a flowcytometer, that was originally designed for human blood and cancer tests. This machine has a laser that illuminates and analyzes cells.

Guidry said the neutrophils were separated into four sub-populations. The researchers did this by using highly specific proteins called monoclonal antibodies. They programmed the antibodies to home in on and attach to a broad spectrum of neutrophils. Through various tests, the scientists whittled to four the number of antibody types needed to identify most neutrophils.

Scientists took samples of neutrophils from four cows. Then they put batches of these into the machine along with various combinations of monoclonal antibodies. When the laser zapped an antibody-neutrophil complex, the antibody glowed. The machine counted the glowing complexes in each batch. Overall test results demonstrated that each type of monoclonal antibody was attaching itself to a different type of neutrophil.

"These results have been confirmed many times in the last two years of our continuing studies of dairy cattle white blood cells," Paape said.

Vince Mazzola (301) 344-1712

#

FSIS SEEKS COMMENTS ON NEW REVIEW SYSTEM FOR APPROVING RAPID TESTS

WASHINGTON, Aug. 16—Prior to formal rulemaking, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is seeking public comments on a new system to be used by the Food Safety and Inspection Service in review and approval of rapid tests for use in meat and poultry inspection.

An advance notice in today's Federal Register requests comments on a test approval system. The notice outlines a uniform system that FSIS would establish before accepting tests developed outside the agency. Tests could be used as official procedures in inspecting meat and poultry.

For example, the system would require test developers to submit details concerning the purpose of the test, its reliability and range of detection, durability under field conditions, ease of performance by inspectors or laboratory personnel, and the availability and shelf life of reagents.

"A uniform procedure for reviewing tests for microbial or chemical contaminants should expedite the process and make industry and academia

aware of our needs and requirements," said Dr. Lester M. Crawford, FSIS administrator.

"The system should help FSIS put new analytical procedures in laboratories and plants as soon as they are commercially available," Crawford said. "Our purpose is to give inspectors the best tools available to ensure the safety and wholesomeness of the nation's meat and poultry supply."

The agency would judge the usefulness of tests. Those judged beneficial then would be evaluated under simulated performance conditions—in the laboratory or at the plant.

"Approvals would not guarantee a market for a commercially developed test. For instance, FSIS might find more suitable tests, encounter limited resources, or shifts in priorities due to unforeseen developments," Crawford said.

Comments on today's notice can be submitted through Nov. 14 to the Policy Office, Attn: Linda Carey, FSIS Hearing Clerk, Room 3175-S, FSIS, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

FSIS ensures that meat and poultry are safe, wholesome and accurately labeled.

Jim Greene (202) 382-0814

#